# Columbia CP

CP: Universities ought to adopt Columbia University’s Roosevelt Institute and CPU policies regarding political discourse and activism

The CPU engages all students to debate campus and domestic current issues. The consensus on political solutions are suggested to administration for implementation

CPU 17 "Columbia Political Union". Columbia Political Union. N. p., 2017. Web. 6 Jan. 2017.

Back when FDR was still a one-term President, Columbia students joined together to form the Political Union, a non-partisan space for open debate and political engagement. Located on one of the most politically active campuses in the country, we do not advocate any particular ideology, and we welcome all students in thinking deeply the pressing issues of today. If there's one thing that we all agree on, it's that political participation must be promoted - both on and off-campus. ​ Last year, our Union underwent profound changes, our newly amended Constitution providing for each on-campus political group to be represented at our meetings. With this, we hope to further develop our participative, chamber-style debates in which every belief has a right to a voice. At CPU, we intent intend to disseminate quality information on campus elections, to play a leading role in organizing Voting Week, and to increase discourse between political groups… Founded in 1935, the Columbia Political Union is organized for and by the students of Columbia University. We seek to enhance involvement in the political process, domestic and international, and draw every member of the campus community into an ongoing discussion of political ideas. As a multi-partisan group, we strive to incorporate all points of view, and voices from a variety of political backgrounds. While our specific goals have changed over the years, our broader goals have remained the same. We continue to strive for an engaged and informed campus discourse surrounding the issues that matter to us on campus, in our country, and throughout the world. GENERAL BODY MEETINGS ​ Interested in becoming a part of the important and exciting work we do? Come to a General Body Meeting to discuss upcoming initiatives, debate current issues and events, and plan future events and projects. Our usual meeting time is 9:00 PM on Mondays, at Lerner 569 if not stated otherwise on our weekly event pages on social media. ​ POLICY COMPETITIONS Throughout the year, the Columbia Political Union assembles representatives from its constituent political groups (Republicans, Democrats, Libertarians, Roosevelt Institute, John Jay Society, and Socialists) to participate in a friendly competition that tackles pressing issues with concrete policy proposals set forth by each group. These competitions are exciting, provocative, and informative opportunities to engage with the intellectual, moral, and practical debates that we all face. We invite General Body members to attend, pose tough questions to participants, and who knows, perhaps even change their opinion on a certain topic. ​ ​ CIVIC ENGAGEMENT ​ The Union is proud to work with institutional partners in the Columbia University community, as well as Columbia's Office of Student Engagement, to present events like Columbia Voting Week which seek to engage campus students and faculty. The Union also works closely with media organizations and the Columbia Elections Board to help disseminate information about campus elections. ​The Columbia Political Union has always been integral to campus political discussion, both of on-campus issues and larger discussions. Most recently, the Columbia Political Union was instrumental in the first year of Voting Week: an exciting week of speaker events and outreach highlighting the importance of civic engagement through the ballot box.

#### Solves aff activism and engagement

#### RI 17 "About Us". Roosevelt Institute at Columbia University. N. p., 2017. Web. 6 Jan. 2017.

Weekly Meetings As as a progressive think tank, we are committed to not just analyzing problems but discussing pragmatic policy solutions. We host weekly discussions on issues that run the policy gamut. Most importantly, discussions are curated to engage everyone -- irrespective of previous knowledge on the subject. Fact sheets are provided at the beginning with background information; center directors dedicate several minutes to providing a brief overview as well. At the end of every meeting, members may choose to share some final thoughts on their ideal policy action. Policy Center Initiatives In addition to weekly meetings, Roosevelt at Columbia also provides more focused opportunities for members. We are organized into seven policy centers that work on yearly and semesterly initiatives. Examples of previous initiatives include a rigorous analysis of Columbia's financial aid policy as part of an ongoing campaign to eliminate the summer work contribution for students who receive financial aid, and the Education Center's reform efforts concerning specialized high schools in New York City. Roosevelt Review Journal Every year we published the Roosevelt Review, our policy journal. All Roosevelt members are highly encouraged to write a piece for the Roosevelt Institute for a center of their choosing. Usually, the policy pieces are written over winter break and edited through spring semester. Even if you do not have experience writing policy, that's totally okay! Most people do not. We provide policy-writing workshops and writers work closely with experienced Center Directors throughout the writing process.

# Solvency

#### changing the topic post facto manipulates balance of prep, which structurally favors the aff because they speak last and use perms – key to engage a prepared adversary and a target of mutual contestation

**Steinberg and Freeley 13**

-- Debate requires a type of stasis point, the only way to generate debate is to have a focused point of difference. If you argue over for a ton of arguments. It should be based on consistency of args.

Steinberg and Freeley 13 [David Steinberg (Lecturer in Communication studies and rhetoric. Advisor to Miami Urban Debate League. Director of Debate at U Miami, Former President of CEDA) and Austin Freeley (attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, JD, Suffolk University). Argumentation and Debate, Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making, 13th edition, 2013, 121-4]

**Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a controversy, a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate**. If everyone is in agreement on a feet or value or policy, there is no need or opportunity for debate; the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. **Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four,” because there is simply no controversy about this statement.** Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions of issues, there is no debate. **Controversy invites decisive choice between competing positions. Debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic[s] of illegal immigration.** How many illegal immigrants live in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity to gain citizenship? Does illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? How are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification card, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this “debate” is likely to be emotional and intense. **However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies are best understood when seated clearly such that all parties to the debate share an understanding about the objective of the debate. This enables focus on substantive and objectively identifiable issues facilitating comparison of competing argumentation leading to effective decisions.** Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, **general feelings of tension without opportunity for resolution, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the U.S. Congress to make substantial progress on the immigration debate.** Of course, arguments may be presented without disagreement. For example, claims are presented and supported within speeches, editorials, and advertisements even without opposing or refutational response. Argumentation occurs in a range of settings from informal to formal, and may not call upon an audi¬ence or judge to make a forced choice among competing claims. Informal dis¬course occurs as conversation or panel discussion without demanding a decision about a dichotomous or yes/no question. However, by definition, debate requires "reasoned judgment on a proposition. The proposition is a statement about which competing advocates will offer alternative (pro or con) argumenta¬tion calling upon their audience or adjudicator to decide. The proposition pro¬vides focus for the discourse and guides the decision process. Even when a decision will be made through a process of compromise, it is important to iden¬tify the beginning positions of competing advocates to begin negotiation and movement toward a center, or consensus position. It is frustrating and usually unproductive to attempt to make a decision when deciders are unclear as to what the decision is about. The proposition may be implicit in some applied debates (“Vote for me!”); however, when a vote or consequential decision is called for (as in the courtroom or in applied parliamentary debate) it is essential that the proposition be explicitly expressed (“the defendant is guilty!”). **In academic debate, the proposition provides essential guidance for the preparation of the debaters prior to the debate, the case building and discourse presented during the debate, and the decision to be made by the debate judge after the debate. Someone disturbed by the problem of a growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, “Public schools are doing a terrible job!** They' are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this” or, worse, “It’s too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. **A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as “What can be done to improve public education?”—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step.** One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies, The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities” and “Resolved; That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. This focus contributes to better and more informed decision making with the potential for better results. In aca¬demic debate, it provides better depth of argumentation and enhanced opportu¬nity for reaping the educational benefits of participation. In the next section, we will consider the challenge of framing the proposition for debate, and its role in the debate. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about a topic, such as ‘"homeless¬ness,” or “abortion,” Or “crime,” or “global warming,” we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish a profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement “Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword” is debatable, yet by itself fails to provide much basis for dear argumen¬tation. If we take this statement to mean Iliad the written word is more effec¬tive than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose, perhaps promoting positive social change. (Note that “loose” propositions, such as the example above, may be defined by their advocates in such a way as to facilitate a clear contrast of competing sides; through definitions and debate they “become” clearly understood statements even though they may not begin as such. There are formats for debate that often begin with this sort of proposition. However, in any debate, at some point, effective and meaningful discussion relies on identification of a clearly stated or understood proposition.) Back to the example of the written word versus physical force. Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, web¬site development, advertising, cyber-warfare, disinformation, or what? What does it mean to be “mightier" in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be, “Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Laurania of our support in a certain crisis?” The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as “Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treaty with Laurania.” Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. **This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.**

# AT Solvency Advocate Theory

Counter interp: The neg may read a counterplan that advocates “Universities ought to adopt Columbia University’s Roosevelt Institute and CPU policies regarding political discourse and activism”

1. **Best Policy Option**. Advocating for ideas out of the traditional scope of research is key to innovate new solutions to new problems.

**2**. **Skew**. Negating is impossible without a PIC because that requires us to ban all speech which is morally indefensible

3. **Ground**. The burden is on them to prove that a solvency advocate exists for all universities, that specifies what policy they all need to implement and how they will do it – absent that assume their requirements are too stringent

## AT Ground/Predcitability

1. No abuse- Columbia uses this, you can find critics

2. No unique impact to predictability, affs will discuss specific colleges anyways and people use it as an example

3. Even if there isn’t ground you can extemp answers just like how the solvency is inferred – we don’t read cards either for solvency so no abuse

## Reasonability

Use reasonability on **T and Theory** with a brightline of structural abuse:

1. Brightline solves subjectivity and prevents a race to the top that kills education for marginal increasing utility of fairness while maintaining norms with general rules so it’s that abuse isn’t a gateway issue because they assume 100% strength of link. Even if there’s a regress this is the best middle ground between maximization and a race to the bottom as I still exclude structural abuse.

2. Substantive abuse is inevitable because qualitative fairness skews vary with every round and argument so its impossible to objectively identify the abuse which kills norms which is the terminal impact of theory. Only structural abuse creates clear abuse that the judge can recognize through the amount of burdens which are impossible to weigh arguments through.